



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

WV
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,982	03/01/2002	Kevin McCarthy	042933/302169	2223
826	7590	10/10/2007	EXAMINER	
ALSTON & BIRD LLP			CHENCINSKI, SIEGFRIED E	
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000			3691	
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/084,982	MCCARTHY, KEVIN	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Siegfried E. Chencinski	3692		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ . 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 4, 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. **Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The security feature composed of a prepaid account, critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). Applicant's Specification requires a prepaid account to serve as security which then permits the seller to be protected in the event the user manages to download the content being pre-studied without making the explicit purchase. The drawings feature the prepaid account (Fig. 3, 52), there is no other payment option in the invention, and the only preferred embodiment states that "The user of the wireless terminal has according to the preferred embodiment of the invention an account at the pre-identified content provider, and wherein the handling of payment for said downloadable content includes transfer of an amount from said account to the content provider upon approval by the user" (p. 2, ll. 5-11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiser et al (hereinafter Wiser, US 6,868,403 B1) in view of Sasaki et al. (US PreGrant Publication 2002/0077988 A1, hereafter Sasaki).

Re Claim 1: Wiser discloses a method of handling payment of downloadable content from a content provider to a terminal via a communication network said method comprises the steps of:

- Opening a software application in said terminal (FIG 1; Client System "Web Browser.")
- Requesting downloadable content from the open software application (Column 16, lines 30-39)
- Automatically starting up a network session (Column 16, lines 36-42)
- Transmitting in said network session a request for downloading said downloadable content for the software application (Column 16, lines 42-47),
- Receiving said downloadable content in a form in which said downloadable content is usable for the software application for pre-study of "unencrypted, lower quality 'clips' .. for free previewing by the consumer in order to decide whether or not to purchase the high fidelity version" (Column 2, lines 13-21; Col. 3, II. 60-65. The usability is implicit);
- enabling a user of the terminal to pre-study said received downloadable content (Column 2, lines 13-21; Col. 3, II. 60-65. The enablement is implicit);
- Handling of payment for the pre-studied downloadable content for the software application for enabling storing of the pre-studied downloadable content for the software application (Col. 4, I. 15 – Col. 5, I. 3; Col. 16, lines 48-64), and

- Storing of the pre-studied downloadable content for the software application from which the downloadable content for the software application was requested in response to handling of the payment (Column 10, lines 2-17, partic. III. 5 & 14).

Wiser does not explicitly disclose

- Receiving downloadable content in a form in which the downloadable content is usable for the software application for pre-study;
- wherein the terminal is a wireless terminal.

However, Sasaki discloses receiving said downloadable content in a form in which said downloadable content is usable for the software application for pre-study, and further, the use of a portable wireless device for receiving digital content (Abstract, II. 2-4).

Further, Sasaki discloses permitting users who have not as yet purchased the digital content to play back the digital content a limited number of times (page 3, [0033], II. 6-10, 14-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosure of Wiser with that of Sasaki in order to use a wireless application protocol to provide data from a remote server to a mobile station, motivated by a desire to provide a mobile telecommunications data service (Orlik, page 1, {0001}, II. 1-2).

Re Claim 2: Wiser in view of Olrik discloses the claimed method supra and Wiser further discloses wherein the requested downloadable content includes at least a graphic icon (Column 2, line 15 "graphics.").

Re Claim 3: Wiser in view of Sasaki discloses the claimed method supra and Olrik further discloses wherein the networks session is a WAP session (Abstract)

Re Claim 4: Wiser in view of Sasaki discloses the claimed method supra and Wiser discloses wherein the WAP session is established with a pre-identified content provider (Column 6, lines 17-38; FIG 1; Refs 128-122-112)

Re Claim 5: Wiser in view of Sasaki discloses the claimed method supra and Wiser further discloses wherein the user of the wireless terminal has an account at the pre-identified content provider, and wherein the handling of payment for said

downloadable content includes transfer of an amount from said account to the content provider upon approval by the user (Column 17 line 53-Column 18 line 6).

Re Claim 6: Wiser in view of Sasaki discloses the claimed method supra and Wiser further discloses wherein the storing of said downloadable content is enabled once the user has approved said payment (Column 18, lines 7-20).

Re Claim 7: Wiser in view of Sasaki discloses the claimed method supra and Wiser further discloses wherein the WAP session is established with a pre-identified Internet portal hosting at least one content provider (Column 6, lines 17-38; FIG 1; Refs 128-122-112)

Re Claim 8: Wiser in view of Sasaki discloses the claimed method supra and Wiser further discloses wherein the user of the wireless terminal has an account at the pre-identified Internet portal, and wherein the handling of payment for said downloadable content includes transfer of an amount from said account to the content provider upon approval by the user (Column 17 line 53-Column 18 line 6).

Re Claim 9: Wiser in view of Sasaki discloses the claimed method supra and Wiser further discloses wherein the storing of said downloadable content is enabled once the user has approved said payment (Column 6, lines 40-42).

Re Claim 15: Wiser in view of Sasaki disclose the claimed method supra. Wiser in view of Sasaki does not explicitly disclose discarding the pre-studied downloadable content if the user does not select to store the pre-studied downloadable content. However, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have known that users of computer storage media often delete or discard stored material in which they have determined that they no longer care to keep that stored information. Such deletions make room for the storage of other information on that storage medium.

Re Claims 10-14: Further wireless terminal claims would have been obvious from the previously rejected method claims 1-4 and 15, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 3692

4. Applicant's arguments filed September 4, 2007 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Siegfried E. Chencinski whose telephone number is 571-272-6792. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM - 6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Abdi can be reached on 02. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SEC

September 17, 2007


FRANTZY POINVIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

All 3692